

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests continued consideration of this application based on the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,101,531 to Eggleston et al. (“Eggleston”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,603 to Joseph (“Joseph”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 to Schwartz et al. (“Schwartz”). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 3-7 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Eggleston, Joseph, and Schwartz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,541 to Bodnar et al. (“Bodnar”). The Examiner has additionally rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Eggleston, Joseph, Schwartz, and Bodnar and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,777 to Skarbo et al. (“Skarbo”).

Applicant has amended claims 1, 8 and 15 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventive subject matter. In particular, claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to emphasize the inventive concept whereby URLs are used for communication within the device, not merely for inter-device communication. Specifically, the URLs in accordance with the present invention facilitate proper forwarding of data from applications operating on the device to external devices and from external devices to applications operating on the device in a seamless manner without the need for application programmers to create custom channels or conduits.

As mentioned in the previous response submitted, a significant problem recognized by embodiments of the present invention resides in the difficulty in programming customized conduits for the transfer of customized information or data between a handheld device and typically a desktop computer. Customized conduits are laborious and difficult ways to customize synchronization between two applications, an application resident on the handheld device and an application resident on the desktop computer. The above amendments to the claims are meant to emphasize this difference from the prior art.

Furthermore, as urged in the previous response submitted, Applicant still assert that the Examiner's primary reference, Eggleston, is directed to a virtual session manager for maintaining a session in a sessionless data communication. Although Eggleston discloses a data exchange manager, Applicant respectfully submits that it does not function in the same manner as the exchange manager of the present invention. First, the primary aim in Eggleston is to filter out any unwanted electronic mails over expense-bearing networks. There is no such filtering required in the exchange manager of the present invention. Any information or data exchange between handled computers and desktop computers are not limited or filtered in any such way. Applicant respectfully submits that Eggleston fails to disclose or suggest crucial elements of the present invention that are recited in the claims.

On pages 3 and 4 of the office action, the Examiner alleges that Eggleston teaches the claimed limitation, "in response to said information, said exchange manager referencing an exchange library from a plurality of exchange libraries, wherein said exchange library defines a communication protocol for said identified transport mechanism and wherein said exchange manager supports a plurality of communication protocols." To satisfy this claimed recitation, the Examiner points to disclosure in Eggleston, at col. 5, lines 23-48:

Both the user's remote communication unit and communication server maintain a S&S index containing identifying (summary) information about data which has not been fully transferred between the communication unit and communication server. As new data is reviewed and filtered for transfer, identifying/summary information is captured for any non-qualifying data by either a host unit or the communication server. This information is stored in the communication server's S&S index, and at least periodically transferred via update messaging to the remote communication unit. Upon reviewing its updates or its S&S index, the user may send a request for such of the data that it desires partial or full transfers or further review. Thus, a cost efficient review mechanism is provided to users for determining whether to transfer data that otherwise fails selected filter parameters. In a fourth main embodiment, a method and apparatus for optimized reply to messaging is provided. When sending a reply, the remote communication unit's controller generates a delta (e.g., data representing the content difference between two messages) between a preceding message and the reply message, and forms an optimized reply using the delta and an identifier of the preceding message. On receiving the optimized reply, the communication server uses the data unit identifier to retrieve the preceding message from a

Applicant respectfully submits that this disclosure does not teach using an exchange library to determine how to communication the information, rather it simply teaches the storage and tracking of communicated information that has not been fully transferred.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “**Eggleston** does not explicitly teach said information having associated therewith a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) containing an identified transport mechanism for transmitting said information and also a destination for said information” and then chooses to use Joseph to teach aspects of using URL’s as they are taught by the invention. In the present invention, resident applications on the electronic device generate URL’s and forward them to the exchange manager to communicate to the exchange manager how to transmit the information to an external device. See page 31, lines 13-20 of the present specification:

At step 455 an application program 310b accesses one or more records from an associated database 365 and exports those records to an exchange manager 350. Included in the file for export is an indication, e.g., a command, indicating to the exchange manager 350 the mechanism to be used to perform the exporting function, e.g., in this case it is synchronization corresponding to library API. Also included is an indication of the file type of the data. Other export ., mechanisms include infrared beaming (IR), radio frequency (RF), electronic mail (SMTP), file transport (FTP), Internet (HTIP), and others.

Joseph, on the other hand, as is clear from the following quote, teaches inter-device communication. See Joseph, col. 3, line 41 - col. 4, line 12:

Embodiments of the present invention provide a mechanism for generating a URL that enables non-standard protocols to be employed in a communications network. In accordance with the present invention, computer systems in the communications network may be enabled to utilize such a URL. Embodiments of the present invention also provide a mechanism for enabling a computer system to employ such a URL independent of the capability of the computer system's browser to support non-standard protocols. A first computer system may perform an operation over a communications network based on a URL. A protocol may be employed by the first computer system to access a second computer system over the communications network. In order to access the second computer system, the first computer system initially determines whether the URL contains a first value corresponding to an encapsulating protocol. If it is determined that the URL contains a value corresponding to an encapsulating protocol, the first computer system determines whether the URL identifies an operation protocol. This may be achieved by determining whether the URL contains an operation protocol key value indicating that the URL contains a value corresponding to an operation protocol.

If an operation protocol is identified by the uniform resource locator, the first computer system selects the operation protocol as the protocol to be employed in accessing the second computer system. A computer system may process a URL received from a first computer system over a communications network. In performing such processing, the computer system determines whether the received URL contains a first value corresponding to an operation protocol. If the URL contains a first value corresponding to an operation protocol, the computer system provides a resource targeted to the first computer system in accordance with an encapsulating protocol. The encapsulating protocol is identified by a second value in the URL. The resource is provided from a resource store that is accessed in accordance with the operation protocol.

This disclosure in Joseph clearly demonstrates that Joseph does not teach communicating information within the electronic device. Joseph describes how some manager might handle the information. The concept of a URL in the context of the invention is distinct and not obvious.

Additionally, on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner clearly indicates that:

Uniform Resource Locator (URL) containing an identified transport mechanism for transmitting said information and also a destination for said information, as disclosed by Joseph, into the teachings of Eggleston to allow a client via the browser uniquely identifying a desired resource by URL (for example, "http://Server A/File Store/File"), which indicates a destination server on which the resource is located, the filename, i.e., the location of the resource and the appropriate protocol (i.e., "http") to be used in retrieving the desired resource

Applicant contends that the present invention is not limited by the limitation “client via the browser,” rather this is handled by the exchange manager accessing the exchange library, which defines necessary protocols and procedures.

On page five of the office action Examiner indicates that “Eggleston-Joseph does not explicitly teach said file having a data file and a data type, said data type unidentifiable to said device external to said handheld device” and introduces Schwartz with reference to col. 6, lines 36-64:

It is generally understood that a computing device equipped with an HTML browser using HTTP can access hypermedia information in a network server. However, HTTP requires considerable computing power and network bandwidth resources. For example, a request from a computing device to establish a communication session with a network server may require an exchange of a number of data packets. In addition to the resources required to implement HTTP, significant resources must be supported in the computing device to request, format, process and display information. This is not a significant

disadvantage in many situations because the computing device, including personal computers and workstations coupled to a network operating HTTP, generally has sufficient computing power, memory and display capabilities. Nevertheless, cellular phone 200 or mobile devices 106 of FIG. 1 typically do not have the computing resources to implement HTTP to run an HTML browser. The computing power in cellular phone 200 or mobile devices 106 of FIG. 1 is typically less than one percent of a laptop personal computer's computing power, the memory capacity is generally less than 128 kilobytes and the graphics display capability is very limited. Cellular phone 200 or any of mobile devices 106 of FIG. 1 is not a replacement of a desktop computing device or the combination of a wireless communication module and a personal computer. Further, making a mobile device, such as cellular phone 200, capable of navigating hypermedia information in a network server is a significant departure from prior art systems.

The Examiner further quotes on page 6 of the Office Action:

The present invention addresses the above described problems and is particularly applicable to navigation of Internet web pages by two-way interactive communication mobile devices (e.g., mobile computing devices, cellular phones, palm-sized computer devices, personal digital assistant devices and Internet capable appliance remote controllers) which are capable of wireless communication via a link server with service providers or network servers on the Internet. Despite the common deficiencies of mobile devices (i.e., a primitive processor, little memory and limited graphics capability) which make it economically and technically impractical for the mobile devices to operate a local browser functioning as if it was in a desktop computer, the present invention allows the mobile devices to interact effectively with the Internet and can be used with a wide variety of wireless communication networks (e.g., cellular digital packet data (CDPD) network, Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) network, Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) network and Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) network).

Applicant is unclear how this teaches the generation of a universal file. Applicant respectfully submits that Schwartz does not teach the use of a file being generated, but rather teaches a method of communication in a more efficient manner by using binary files that are less processor intensive than http transport mechanisms. The file, on the other hand, has to be generated and can include encryption, none of which are meant to facilitate increased efficiency, but are used for their functional advantages in communications. Additionally, in the present invention, the file is communicated using the specified protocol in the URL whereas there is no teaching in Schwartz of any communication occurring over a diverse set of protocols.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that any combination of Eggleston, Joseph, Schwartz, Bodnar and Skarbo does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention.

Application No.: 09/598,668
Reply to Office Action of: March 27, 2008

The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21, by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: August 27, 2008

By: /Reena Kuyper/
Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860